

REMARKS1. Introduction

In the Office action claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14, 16, and 21-25 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 7, 8, 10-14, and 17-20 of copending U.S. Patent Application 09/851,856. To overcome this rejection, Applicant has provided a terminal disclaimer, disclaiming any portion of the term of the present patent application that would extend beyond the term of a patent issued from U.S. Patent Application 09/851,856. Also, in the Office action claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14, 16, and 21-25 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 10-14, and 17-20 of copending U.S. Patent Application 09/851,857. To overcome this rejection, Applicant has provided a terminal disclaimer, disclaiming any portion of the term of the present patent application that would extend beyond the term of a patent issued from U.S. Patent Application 09/851,857. As a result, Applicant respectfully contends that claims 1 and 11, as amended, define an invention suitable for patent protection.

2. Rejections under 35 USC §102

In the Office action, claims 21-22 and 25 were rejected as allegedly being anticipated by Arns et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,449,066 and Agranat et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,542,264. Also, claims 21 and 23-25 were rejected as allegedly being anticipated by Ford, U.S. Patent No. 6,304,694. To overcome these rejections, Applicant has amended claim 21 to include the subject matter of claims 1 and 10 that was

considered allowable in view of the terminal disclaimers filed herewith. As a result, Applicant respectfully contends that claim 21, as amended, defines an invention suitable for patent protection.

3. Rejections under 35 USC §112, second paragraph

In the Office action, claim 1 was rejected as allegedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regarded as the invention. To that end, claim 1 has been amended to ensure that the same comports with the requirements set forth in 35 USC § 112, second paragraph.

4. The Non-obviousness of the Dependent Claims

Considering that the dependent claims include all the features of the independent claims from which they depend, these claims are patentable to the extent that the independent claims are patentable. Therefore, Applicants respectfully contend that the dependent claims define systems suitable for patent protection.



Applicants respectfully request examination in view of the remarks. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Signed: Alexis Sheffield  
 Typed Name: Alexis Sheffield  
 Date: June 14, 2004

Respectfully Submitted,

*Kenneth C. Brooks*  
**RECEIVED**

Kenneth C. Brooks  
 Reg. No. 38,393

JUN 22 2004

Technology Center 2600

P.O. Box 10417  
 Austin, Texas 78766-1417  
 Telephone: 512-527-0104  
 Facsimile: 512-527-0107  
patentsrus@earthlink.net